

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-22, 24, and 27-51 were pending and presented for examination in this application. In the Supplemental Office Action dated February 19, 2008, claims 1-22 were rejected and claims 24 and 27-51 were allowed. Applicants thank Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses Examiner's comments below.

### **Response to Rejection of Double Patenting**

In the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejections claims 1-22 on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent 6,781,570 ("Arrigo"). To obviate the basis for this rejection for these claims, Applicants submit a Terminal Disclaimer with this Response. Thus, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

### **Conclusion**

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-22 are in condition for allowance in view of the Terminal Disclaimer filed herewith. Further, Applicants respectfully submit claims 24 and 27-51 also are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Simone Arrigo et al.

Date: April 17, 2008

By: /Rajiv P. Patel/

Rajiv P. Patel, Reg. No. 39,327  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7607  
Fax: (650) 938-5200